

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 11-13, 23-43 and 54-64 were withdrawn from consideration, claims 1-10, 14-19, 21-22 and 44-53 were rejected, and claim 20 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claim 20. Claim 20 has been placed into independent form and should now be a condition for allowance.

Claims 2-3, 8, 14-22, 44-45 and 48-49 have been amended, claims 1 and 46-47 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 2-10, 14-22, 44-45 and 48-53 remain pending in the present application. All claim amendments are fully supported throughout the written description and figures of the specification.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 15 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, and the rejection is believed overcome.

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-19, 21-22, 45-50 and 52 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Castano-Mears et al. reference, US Patent No.: 6,457,518. Claims 1, 2, 14-18, 22, 44, 45 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Meldau reference, US Patent No.: 3,556,219. Claims 1, 2, 14-18, 22, 44, 45 and 47-49 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Jones et al. reference, US Patent No.: 5,515,915. Each of these rejections is traversed. However, the rejections are believed no longer applicable based on the amendments to the claims. Specifically, claim 20, indicated as allowable, has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the claim from which it depends. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice, and claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-22 and 44 now all ultimately depend from newly independent claim 20. Accordingly, claims 2-10, 14-22 and 44 should be in condition for allowance.

Additionally, independent claim 45 has been amended to recite "attaching the filter media to the screen" in combination with "routing a control line along the second portion" and "routing a side conduit along the second portion." None of the references cited by the Examiner discloses

all elements of amended independent claim 45. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 51 and 53 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the Castano-Mears et al. reference in view of the Tubel et al. reference, US Patent No.: 6,281,489, or the Perales reference, US Patent No.: 5,163,321. Claims 5-6 ultimately depend from amended independent claim 20, and claims 51 and 53 ultimately depend from amended independent claim 45. Each of these claims is patentable for the reasons provided above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend and for the specific language recited in each dependent claim. The additional references cited by the Examiner do not obviate the deficiencies of the Castano-Mears et al. reference.

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the Castano-Mears et al. reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed. However, the rejection is believed moot, because claim 44 now depends from claim 20, which has been indicated as allowable.

Applicants hereby petition to extend the period for response by one month, from October 16, 2003 to November 16, 2003. The enclosed payment includes the fee associated with this extension in the amount of \$110.00 in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the pending claims are believed patentable over the cited references. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Van Someren
Reg. No. 36,038

Date: October 21, 2003

PO Box 2107
Cypress, TX 77410-2107
Voice: (281) 373-4369